

1 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
2 LAUREN R. GOLDMAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)
lgoldman@gibsondunn.com
3 DARCY C. HARRIS (admitted *pro hac vice*)
dharris@gibsondunn.com
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
Telephone: (212) 351-4000
Facsimile: (212) 351-4035

6 ELIZABETH K. MCCLOSKEY (SBN 268184)
emccloskey@gibsondunn.com
7 ABIGAIL A. BARRERA (SBN 301746)
abarrera@gibsondunn.com
555 Mission Street, Suite 3000
8 San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 393-4622
9 Facsimile: (415) 801-7389

10 ANDREW M. KASABIAN (SBN 313210)
akasabian@gibsondunn.com
11 333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071 USA
12 Telephone: (213) 229-7311
Facsimile: (213) 229-6311
13 *Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*

14 *Additional Attorneys in Signature Block*

15
16 GEORGE FELDMAN MCDONALD, PLLC
LORI G. FELDMAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)
LFeldman@4-justice.com
102 Half Moon Bay Drive
Croton-on-Hudson, New York 10520
Phone: (917) 983-9321
Fax: (888) 421-4173

17 BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
JOEL D. SMITH (SBN 244902)
jsmith@bursor.com
1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Telephone: (925) 300-4455
Facsimile: (925) 407-2700

18 *Steering Committee Co-Chairs for All
Plaintiffs in Consolidated Action*

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE META PIXEL TAX FILING CASES

Master File No. 3:22-cv-07557-SI

This Document Relates To:

PUTATIVE CLASS ACTION

Case No. 3:22-cv-07557-SI, All Actions

**JOINT STATEMENT REGARDING
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Hon. Judge Virginia K. DeMarchi

JOINT STATEMENT

In accordance with the Court’s direction at the April 20, 2023 Discovery Conference, see Dkt. No. 216, the parties in *In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litigation*, Case No. 22-cv-3580-WHO (VKD), *In re Meta Pixel Tax Filing Cases*, Case No. 22-cv-07557-SI (VKD), and *Gershzon v. Meta*, Case No. 3:23-cv-00083-SI (VKD) have continued to meet and confer regarding the terms of a protective order to be entered in their respective cases. While the parties have made progress, they have been unable to reach agreement on all issues.

8 The Tax Case Plaintiffs' proposed protective order is attached as Exhibit A, Meta's
9 proposed protective order is attached as Exhibit B, and a redline comparing the Tax Plaintiffs'
10 proposed protective order and Meta's proposed protective order is attached as Exhibit C. The
11 parties submit the following statements regarding the remaining disputes.

I. PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT

In this statement and their proposed Protective Order, the Tax Case Plaintiffs¹ address a single area where the Tax Case Plaintiffs' proposal differs from those offered by the Healthcare Case Plaintiffs. During further discussions with Meta over the terms of the Protective Order, it has become clear that Meta may produce a significant volume of materials with redactions. Meta proposes, for instance, to redact snippets of source code that appear in internal Meta communications.

19 The Tax Case Plaintiffs do not object to Meta’s proposals in this regard but proposed that
20 the parties should agree to the maintenance and production of Redaction Logs specifying the
21 location of such materials and the reasons for redaction. Specifically, the Tax Case Plaintiffs
22 proposed additions to Section 13.5 of the Proposed Order as follows (additions underlined):

¹ This Joint Statement refers to *In re Meta Pixel Tax Filing Cases* (Case No. 3:22-cv-07557) as the “Tax Case” and the plaintiffs therein as the “Tax Case Plaintiffs”, to *In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litigation* (Case No. 3:22-cv-03580) as the “Healthcare Case” and the plaintiffs therein as the “Healthcare Case Plaintiffs,” and *Gershzon v. Meta Platforms, Inc.* (Case No. 3:23-cv-00083) as the “DMV Case” and the plaintiffs therein as the “DMV Case Plaintiffs.”

1 13.5. Privilege & Redaction Logs. The Parties' agreement regarding
2 the requirement for, timing, format, and content of privilege logs is
3 memorialized in a separate agreement. All materials redacted under
4 any provision of this Protective Order shall be listed on a Redaction
5 Log specifying by bates number the individual pages redacted and
6 the reasons for such redactions. On request, a party must produce
7 said Redaction Log within ten (10) business days.

8 These revisions are necessary for practical purposes. If Meta is to produce a significant
9 volume of redacted documents under the Protective Order, the parties and the Court will need a
10 ready reference showing the volume of such materials, their location, and the reasons for redaction.
11 Further, the Tax Case Plaintiffs' suggested approach is consonant with the Federal Rules and
12 standard practice in the federal courts. *See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(g)* ("A filing that contains
13 redacted information may be filed together with a reference list that identifies each item of redacted
14 information and specifies an appropriate identifier that uniquely corresponds to each item listed.");
15 *Mas v. Cumulus Media Inc.*, No. C-10-1396 EMC, 2010 WL 4916402, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 22,
16 2010) (allowing plaintiff to redact portions of documents revealing nonresponsive financial
17 information but ordering that "[a]ny redaction should be accounted for in a redaction log."). The
18 Tax Case Plaintiffs have confirmed that the DMV Case Plaintiffs support the addition of this
19 redaction-log requirement and that the Healthcare Case Plaintiffs do not oppose it. For all these
20 reasons, the Tax Case Plaintiffs request that the Court's Protective Order in this matter include a
21 redaction-log requirement in substantially the form suggested above.

II. META'S STATEMENT

22 Meta incorporates its positions from the joint statement filed in the Healthcare Case
23 concerning the protective order as if fully stated herein. As with the Rule 502(d) Clawback Order,
24 it is Meta's position that there should be a single protective order that is entered in each of the
25 cases that have been referred to this Court for discovery. With respect to the topic raised by the
26 Tax Case Plaintiffs specifically, Meta responds as follows.

27 **Section 13.5.** The Tax Case Plaintiffs propose that the parties prepare redaction logs listing
28 documents that contain redactions and the reasons for redaction. Meta's position is that the
proposed redaction logs are not necessary. Creating a separate redaction log to cover Source Code

1 redactions (and any other unspecified “materials redacted under any provision” of the Protective
2 Order) will serve no practical purpose. The parties have already agreed to separately discuss
3 privilege logs, and Meta intends to utilize redactions that specify the reason for the redaction within
4 the redaction itself. So, for example, if Source Code is redacted from a document, there will be an
5 opaque box in place of the Source Code content, and there will be text within the box that reads,
6 “Redacted – Source Code” that will look like this:

Redacted – Source Code

10 Accordingly, the “reasons for redaction” and their quantity will already be clear to
11 Plaintiffs from the face of the documents that Meta produces, and a redaction log would be
12 duplicative and is thus unnecessary.

13 It is also not appropriate to impose the Tax Case Plaintiffs' obligation to provide this
14 unnecessary redaction log upon "ten (10) business days" notice. The Court already provided
15 guidance to the parties on the timing for the production of privilege logs in the context of the ESI
16 protocol (April 20, 2023 Hr'g Tr. at 100:11–101:23), and the Tax Case Plaintiffs' 10-business-day
17 requirement is both unreasonable and ignores that guidance and the court's instruction that the
18 parties separately meet and confer regarding interim deadlines for items like privilege logs.

19 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2(g) is inapposite; that rule relates to redacted
20 information in court filings and it contemplates a completely different procedure—one in which
21 the “reference list” actually contains the confidential information at issue along with appropriate
22 “identifiers” to use in place of the confidential information in public court filings, and the reference
23 list itself is confidential and “must be filed under seal.” Here, by contrast, the redactions will be
24 made in documents produced in discovery—not public court filings—and the Tax Case Plaintiffs
25 will be able to view the underlying Source Code content in the Source Code review room to the
26 extent it is relevant and upon reasonable request from the Tax Case Plaintiffs (as discussed in the

1 joint statement filed in the Healthcare Case). Accordingly, there is no need for the Tax Case
2 Plaintiffs' proposed language above regarding redaction logs.

3 Dated: May 5, 2023

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

4 By: /s/ Lauren R. Goldman
5 Lauren R. Goldman

6 LAUREN R. GOLDMAN (*pro hac vice*)
7 lgoldman@gibsondunn.com
8 DARCY C. HARRIS (*pro hac vice*)
dharris@gibsondunn.com
9 200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
Telephone: (212) 351-4000
10 Facsimile: (212) 351-4035

11 ELIZABETH K. MCCLOSKEY (SBN 268184)
emccloskey@gibsondunn.com
12 ABIGAIL A. BARRERA (SBN 301746)
abarrera@gibsondunn.com
13 555 Mission Street, Suite 3000
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 393-8200
15 Facsimile: (415) 393-8306

16 ANDREW M. KASABIAN (SBN 313210)
akasabian@gibsondunn.com
17 333 South Grand Avenue
18 Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 229-7311
19 Facsimile: (213) 229-6311

20 COOLEY LLP
21 MICHAEL G. RHODES (SBN 116127)
rhodesmg@cooley.com
22 KYLE C. WONG (SBN 224021)
kwong@cooley.com
23 CAROLINE A. LEBEL (SBN 340067)
clebel@cooley.com
24 3 Embarcadero Center, 20th Floor
25 San Francisco, CA 94111-4004
Telephone: (415) 693-2000

27 *Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*

1 Dated: May 5, 2023

GEORGE FELDMAN MCDONALD, PLLC

2 By: /s/ Lori G. Feldman
3 Lori G. Feldman

4 LORI G. FELDMAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)
5 LFeldman@4-justice.com
6 102 Half Moon Bay Drive
7 Croton-on-Hudson, New York 10520
Telephone: (917) 983-9321
Facsimile: (888) 421-4173

8 BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.

9 By: /s/ Joel D. Smith
10 Joel D. Smith

11 Joel D. Smith (SBN 244902)
jsmith@bursor.com
12 Neal J. Deckant (SBN 322946)
ndeckant@bursor.com
13 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
14 Telephone: (925) 300-4455
Facsimile: (925) 407-2700

16 GEORGE FELDMAN MCDONALD, PLLC
17 David J. George. (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
DGeorge@4-Justice.com
18 Brittany L. Brown. (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
BBrown@4-justice.com
9897 Lake Worth Road, Suite #302
19 Lake Worth, FL 33467
Telephone: (561) 232-6002
Facsimile: (888) 421-4173

22 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Co-Chairs

23 LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.
24 REBECCA A. PETERSON (SBN 241858)
rapeterson@locklaw.com
100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200
25 Minneapolis, MN 55401
Telephone: (612) 339-6900
Facsimile: (612) 339-0981

1 FOSTER YARBOROUGH, PLLC
2 Patrick Yarborough (admitted *pro hac vice*)
3 patrick@fosteryarborough.com
4 917 Franklin Street, Suite 220
5 Houston, TX 77002
6 Telephone: (713) 331-5254

7 THE HODA LAW FIRM, PLLC
8 Marshal J. Hoda (admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 marshal@thehodalawfirm.com
10 12333 Sowden Road, Suite B, PMB 51811
11 Houston, TX 77080
12 Telephone: (832) 848-0036
13 Facsimile: (832) 201-0364

14 Plaintiffs' Steering Committee Members

CIVIL L.R. 5-1(h)(3) ATTESTATION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(h)(3), I, Lauren R. Goldman, hereby attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from all signatories.

Dated: May 5, 2023

By: /s/ Lauren R. Goldman

Lauren R. Goldman